

Before doing so, I wish to call attention to the proposition, which the gentleman has given notice that he shall introduce, to district the city of Baltimore, and to say that I think it is a little extraordinary that the sense of justice which impelled him to give a representation to the minorities in the city, would not have impelled him also to give a representation to the minorities in the counties.

In voting against the reconsideration, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have not changed one solitary view which I have taken of the original proposition, for the basis of representation, against which I voted. I do not withdraw a single argument or a single remark, but on the contrary reaffirm all my objections.

I shall vote against the reconsideration, first because the gentleman from Kent has distinctly avowed his intention to reduce the Baltimore delegation; and that would be the "last ounce upon the camel's back." I vote against it also upon the ground that it is too late in the day, and the time is too valuable to reargue questions of such moment. We have fought that battle and let the result here stand for "weal or woe" for the public verdict.

Mr. JENIFER. I shall vote for this proposition, but not in order to reduce the delegation of the city of Baltimore; because I have always been willing that Baltimore should have ten delegates, provided, the counties were fairly represented. But, in other particulars, the plan was not satisfactory, and if my friend from Baltimore county had not called for the previous question, I am satisfied it could have been adjusted. I wish now to state a fact, of which, perhaps, the members from Prince George's, themselves, may not be aware: that the returns of the population of that county were incorrect by nearly 1800. I am assured that it should have been upwards of 23,000 instead of 21,550. Prince George's then, with a population of more than 23,000, has but three delegates; while Allegany, with a population of but 22,872, has four. This must be corrected; and, if there is any doubt about the fact, we can easily ascertain it in a few days.

Mr. J. here drew a parallel between different sections in relation to the aggregate representation of adjoining counties, and said, that great injustice would be done if the article adopted was not modified, especially in regard to Prince George's, Charles, Montgomery and Queen Ann's counties, to say nothing of the smaller counties. The three counties, Charles, Prince George's and Montgomery, adjoining to each other, in the same congressional district, with an aggregate population of more than 55,000, will have but seven representatives in the House of Delegates, whilst the two counties of Allegany and Washington whose population is only 51,458, will have nine delegates. Thus two adjoining counties, with a less population by thousands, will have a larger representation by two, than three counties also adjoining each other—and this is done by an arbitrary rule.

Mr. J. said there was another fact to which the lower counties, whether of the Eastern or Western shore, should not shut their eyes, which was that the seven counties bordering on the Pennsylvania line, with the city of Baltimore, would have forty delegates in the popular branch of the Legislature, whilst the remaining fourteen counties had but thirty-four.

Mr. J. said he was not as sensitive as some gentlemen were upon the subject of our institutions, but he thought it right and proper, (if the gentlemen of those upper counties were sincere, as he was sure those in this Convention were,) in desiring to protect the larger slave holding counties, that no cause of apprehension should be given. If for no other reason, the representation should be equal. Add, then, one delegate to Prince George's, to which she is clearly entitled, give to Charles, Montgomery and Queen Anne's each the one they would have been entitled to had not the fraction of a fourth been adopted instead of a half. This addition to those counties is demanded by sheer justice, and which I know was desired by my friend Mr. GRASON, who proposed this apportionment bill. This, Mr. J. considered, could have been done had not the previous question been called and carried at the moment he was on the floor to move those amendments, which, he had reason to believe, at the time, would have been acceptable to a majority of the Convention.

Mr. J. continued. I am utterly astonished to see how the proposition was carried. The vote was 42 to 40; and I find that some of the smallest counties of the State were disfranchised by their representatives voting for it; and when the previous question was called, cutting off amendments, they voted for that also. They have sacrificed their counties, and they are responsible for it. As the gentleman from Kent has not made any proposition, I will give notice that I shall move, if the motion to reconsider shall prevail, the amendments I have indicated, adding one delegate to each of the counties having but two by the present bill, and one additional delegate to Prince Georges, which will give to those counties the same number of delegates they have under the present Constitution. The House of Delegates will then consist of eighty-five members. The two sections of the State where there is supposed to be conflicting interests, will be very equally divided.

Mr. J. went on to show that this fair distribution was lost principally by gentlemen from some of the smaller counties voting against amendments and substitutes, which would have placed them on a fair footing with other portions of the State, because the city of Baltimore was given ten delegates. Now, Baltimore has ten delegates, the small counties but two—whereas had they supported the amendments, the small counties would have had three each, and the city of Baltimore still but ten.

Mr. DAVIS said the motion of his honorable and excellent friend from Kent, [Mr. Chambers,]